
Strengthening Teacher Quality and Support: Next Steps for Arizona

Governor's Committee for Teacher Quality and Support
Final Report, October 2007

Acknowledgements

This document reflects the collective work of the Governor's Committee for Teacher Quality and Support, as prepared by Penny Kotterman.

Governor's Committee for Teacher Quality and Support:

Jan Amator
Deputy Associate Superintendent
Highly Qualified Professionals
Arizona Department of Education

Cathleen Barton
Education Director
Intel Corporation

Yvonne Billingsley
Associate Superintendent
Pinal County Schools

Meredith Curley
Associate Dean
University of Phoenix, College of Education

Debbie D'Amore
Chief Deputy Superintendent
Pima County School Superintendent's Office

Robert I. Donofrio
Executive Director
University-School Partnerships
Arizona State University

Debra L. Duvall
School Superintendent
Mesa Unified School District

Reuben Gonzales
Business Representative
State Farm Insurance

John Haeger
President
Northern Arizona University

JoAnne Hilde
President
Arizona State Board of Education

Joyce Kaser
Senior Program Associate
WestEd

Janet Johnson
Faculty Chair for Education
Rio Salado Community College

Ronald Marx
Dean
University of Arizona, College of Education

Andrew Morrill
Vice President
Arizona Education Association

Linda Nelson
Superintendent
Chino Valley Unified School District

Carol Peck
President and CEO
Rodel Foundation

Bill Stuart
Executive Director
Small and Rural Schools Association

Building for the Future

Today, Arizona is the fastest growing state in the country. It is anticipated that in the long term, this growth will be driven and sustained by the State's emerging high-tech, high skills economy. To support this rapid development, Arizona education must keep pace. To strengthen teacher performance and thereby significantly improve student results, Governor Napolitano established the Governor's Committee for Teacher Quality and Support in May of 2005. The 17-member committee consisted of teachers, members of the business community, and representatives of public and private sector teaching colleges. The committee issued their first summary report in January of 2006.

The committee was charged with developing recommendations to increase the number of excellent teachers in the classroom. Specifically, the committee focused on recommendations to modernize compensation, college preparation, and professional opportunity and development for teachers in Arizona. In addition, the committee recommended a teacher professional development system to ensure uniform access to high quality professional development; identified opportunities and obstacles in recruiting good students to be teachers; and conducted a survey of Arizona's teachers to find common working condition impediments in 2006 and 2007.

It is clear that the single greatest factor influencing student achievement is teacher quality. And while we have made some progress, Arizona still has no cohesive policy or requirements for professional development at the state level. This means there is no infrastructure for supporting professional development or reliable data to measure the extent or type of professional development available, amount of money spent, or the quality or impact achieved. Teachers' salaries still lag behind the majority of states in the nation, and student achievement is a struggle for too many of our students. The achievement gap is not closing for our neediest students. We face teacher shortages in some critical areas, and recruitment and retention issues still plague our schools and drain scarce resources.

The Governor's Committee for Teacher Quality and Support, through the Governor's P-20 Council Teacher Committee, worked this year to refine and update their recommendations from the first year. These recommendations form the bedrock of policy, program development and implementation; they are for the innovative and creative soul in all of us who care about our schools and the role they play in making our communities and our state a great place to work, to live and to thrive. They are built on the foundation of five successful initiatives in Arizona (listed on page 2), and on a host of experiences, research and data to back them up.

From these initiatives five themes have emerged:

1. Enhance and improve teacher preparation, recruitment and retention efforts
2. Develop a system of comprehensive teacher compensation
3. Build strategic and systemic professional development
4. Create a Professional Standards Board
5. Make the Teacher Working Conditions Survey a statewide effort

Arizona Education Initiatives

Governor's P-20 Council: In the summer of 2005 Governor Napolitano appointed a P-20 Council to explore ways that the state can achieve a "more effective, efficient, and equitable education pipeline" (Executive Order 2005-19). Some of the possible strategies include aligning high school, college, and work expectations; helping students meet high standards and prepare for either post-secondary education or workforce training after high school; providing high quality teachers, especially in mathematics, science, and literacy; and strengthening secondary and postsecondary accountability. The Council issued their first set of recommendations in December of 2006.

Arizona's Career Ladder Program: Started in 1984 as a five-year pilot, there are 28 districts (encompassing about one third of all teachers in the state) that participate in the program. Career Ladders are based on the following key components: developing a higher level of teaching skills and responsibility, increased student achievement, professional development, and pay for performance.

The Governor's Master Teacher Program: Created in 2005 with funds from two grant sources, this program is the beginning of a statewide mentoring and induction program that currently places mentors in Arizona schools. Teachers are chosen to be mentors for their exemplary instruction and their ability to help and support their colleagues. The program is driven by the state's induction standards and also supports candidates for National Board Certification across the state.

AZTEP Title II Grant: Arizona Teacher Excellence Program (AZTEP) is a three-year U.S. Department of Education Title II: Teacher Quality Enhancement grant awarded to Governor Napolitano's office in September, 2003. The grant addresses the teacher shortage and high turnover in schools located on Arizona's Indian reservations and in former Enterprise Zones by funding the recruitment and retention of high quality teachers. More specifically, the project provides funding for teacher preparation and recruitment, retention of both new and veteran teachers, and local professional development planning.

Education 2000, Teacher Pay for Performance Initiative: In 2000 the Arizona electorate passed Proposition 301, which called for pay-for-performance in all school districts in the state. The legislation provided for a six tenths of one percent sales tax increase with 20 percent of the monies going for base pay and 40 percent designated for performance pay. Over the past five years districts have developed plans, many of which are team or school based. Looking for more uniformity in plans, in August, 2005, the Arizona state legislature passed S.B. 1074 that calls for districts to develop systems that include the following: district and school performance, measures of academic progress, either dropout or graduation rates, attendance rates, rating of school quality by parents and students, and teacher and administrator input. The districts must submit a copy of their performance-based compensation system and its evaluation plan annually to the Arizona Department of Education (ADE). ADE evaluates 25 percent of the plans each year.

Update and Current Status

Following are the original committee recommendations accompanied by a brief elaboration, along with updates on progress made to date.

Teacher Compensation Recommendations

Base Salary

Establish a minimum teaching salary.

The state should provide a beginning wage competitive with other professions (e.g., accountants, registered nurses, physical therapists) requiring a similar amount of education and experience. Having a starting salary of \$35,000 (Arizona Town Hall, 2004) will help keep new teachers in Arizona and can provide prospective teachers an incentive to choose teaching as a career. This figure is higher than the national average of \$29,733 (National Education Association, 2005) and should give Arizona some recruiting advantage.

Current disparities in starting pay give some districts advantage over others in recruiting and retaining teachers. Often an urban district can offer a starting salary that exceeds what teachers can make in a rural district, even with many years of experience. The state average starting salary of \$28,218 (Arizona Education Association, 2005) means that many teachers, most outside of Maricopa County, start well below the national average, making recruiting high caliber professionals difficult.

Performance and Variable Pay

Provide substantial performance pay opportunities.

The level of financing of pay-for performance provisions funded by the Proposition 301 sales tax has not provided significant enough revenue to generate true incentives for teacher performance across the state. For this reason, increased funding for expanded pay-for-performance systems is needed. Pay-for-performance must be clearly defined for all constituencies, easy to understand, and provide for attainable goals in order to be a true incentive. The Auditor General reports on district systems demonstrate wide variance in how performance based pay is determined in districts. A survey of teachers in 2002 by the Arizona Education Association (AEA) indicated that many teachers did not understand the goals that were expected of them and had had no role in defining the goals or processes used to determine their performance based compensation (AEA Professional Development, 2002). Whatever system is used should promote high performance for individual teachers in the attainment of classroom, school, and district goals, leading to improvement in student learning.

Expand Career Ladder to all districts.

The Arizona Career Ladder program was adopted by the legislature in 1982. According to ARS 15.918, a "Career ladder program" means a program which:

- a) Establishes a multi-level system of teaching positions.

- b) Provides opportunities to teachers for continued professional advancement.
- c) Requires at least improved or advanced teaching skill for advancement to a higher level and other components such as additional higher-level instructional responsibilities and demonstration of pupil academic progress.
- d) Uses a performance based compensation system.

Arizona's Career Ladder program has been recognized nationally for its success and longevity. The program is funded using a statutory formula. After the initial 28 school districts were selected, funding for the program was halted and additional districts could not apply. Most districts that participate share a portion of the cost with the local community and the state. The 28 districts that have the Career Ladder program have more money available to them for performance based compensation because they have Career Ladder funds in addition to the funds made available for performance-based compensation by Proposition 301 in 2000. This program should be reviewed, updated and expanded statewide into a model that could serve as the infrastructure encompassing key strategies to improve student performance, improved teaching practice, and improve teacher retention.

Provide incentives to teach in hard-to-staff schools.

In 2003, the Morrison Institute for Public Policy issued a study on teacher shortages in Arizona. The study confirmed that school districts that have more disadvantaged students or are located in rural areas often have more difficulty recruiting quality teachers. Although pay is only one factor that might attract a teacher to such a school, it is a major one. Class size, paperwork, and discipline were the other significant factors. The report recommended salary incentives and tuition reimbursements as possible strategies to address this issue in the short term, but the working conditions issues must be addressed in order to increase retention in these areas (*Is There a Teacher shortage: K-12 Demand and Supply in Arizona, Morrison Institute, 2003*). Other incentives may include a one-time hiring bonus, assistance in securing housing, a commuting allowance, or scholarships and payment of student loans.

Research the viability and possible pay levels for differentiated pay.

Individuals in many professional careers are often compensated differently based on their area of expertise and their availability; commonly known in the private sector as "differentiated pay." Application of this type of pay system to the teaching profession has traditionally raised concerns among educators about equity, collegiality and fairness, since early pay structures for teachers were based primarily on gender and grade level of the teacher, with men and secondary teachers making more money. As the economy and the profession have changed over the years, many districts across the country have experimented, with varying degrees of success, with types of differentiated pay. Districts often give hiring bonuses or stipends to ELL and Special Education teachers, for example. Given the ongoing and expected shortages in certain subject areas (e.g., special education, mathematics, science, and non-native English language instruction) the issue should be explored as a possible tool to improve teacher recruitment and retention. A study of the need for differentiated pay in Arizona, the degree to which additional pay would be an incentive to teachers in areas of short supply, and the cultural changes required to institute differentiated pay will help determine whether this approach is a viable long-term solution.

Current Status:

During the 2006 legislative session, the Legislature appropriated \$100M for increasing teacher and non-administrative education employee pay. School districts have applied that funding in a variety of ways, not necessarily in a consistent manner aimed at raising overall base salaries as the committee had recommended. There is little data to suggest that the issue of low overall entry level and base salaries has been addressed adequately, especially in high poverty districts, hard to teach

schools, and rural and remote areas of the state. The average teacher salary for the 2005-2006 school year was \$42,905. In 2001-2002, the year immediately following the passage of Proposition 301, the average teacher salary was \$39,373. This represents just under \$3,500 over a 4-year period, of roughly two percent a year. These increases do not demonstrate a significant increase in base salaries over time. In fact, they only slightly exceed inflation.

The Legislature did pass a Performance Based Compensation Task Force Bill in the 2006 session, aimed at setting parameters and overall accountability for Proposition 301 performance based pay systems. The Task Force has reviewed the first quarter of the school districts in the state and the legislation required that they make recommendations regarding future performance based pay structures by 2010. The unofficial initial findings suggest that few districts use a collaborative approach in defining their systems or yearly goals, systems often have such complex measurements and requirements that teachers often do not understand the goals they are working to achieve, and that the “bonus” is often such a small percent (1-2 percent) of overall salary that it is not seen as relevant. Many teachers see these systems as “extra pay for extra work” rather than true performance incentives or systems that reward improved performance. Almost none of them take into account targeted professional development, reflective practice, or progress toward professional growth in any systematic way.

During the past year, the P-20 Council also recommended similar changes in teacher compensation, focusing on the immediate need for market based pay for math, science and special education. Those recommendations were adopted in December 2006. The ADE collects some data on vacant teacher positions and emergency certificates in order to determine real shortages in particular areas. The Governor’s 2007 budget includes \$46 million for teacher pay raises and includes \$2.25 million for a forgivable student loan program for students in Arizona’s pre-service teaching programs in areas of high demand, including math, science and special education.

Professional Development Recommendations

Professional Development Standards

Adopt the National Staff Development Council’s “Standards for Staff Development.”

The National Staff Development Council’s (NSDC) standards (**Appendix 6**) are considered the premier standards for professional development. They have been adopted by many states, school districts, and other organizations that provide professional development. The standards function as policy and anchor implementation. By adopting them the state assumes leadership in changing policy, incentives, and resources to ensure that all teachers throughout the state have access to high-quality professional development. At this time 35 states have written standards for professional development (“Stat of the Week,” 2005).

Current Status:

The State Board of Education (SBE) has not taken formal action on this recommendation. However, the Arizona Department of Education (ADE) has adopted these standards and has supported a number of school districts as they work to implement them. A number of local school districts report that they utilize the standards in some form to guide their planning, implementation and delivery of professional development. The *Arizona Professional Teaching Standards*, adopted by the SBE in 1998 are used to guide teacher preparation, certification, professional development and in many cases new program

development. The nine standards include performance indicators that are aligned with many of the NSDC Standards. Standard six is directly related to teacher development of a Professional Development Plan. Arizona has not yet reached a uniform adoption and implementation of consistent standards and practices for professional development.

Phase in the professional development standards over time to allow the state to build the resources and infrastructure necessary to support schools and educators. The state should immediately provide technical assistance to help educators understand the standards as well as guideposts for selecting and offering effective, standards-based professional development. The state should provide technical assistance grants to schools and districts demonstrating the most need.

Some districts have already adopted the NSDC standards and established quality professional development programs within their districts. Most districts, however, have not developed their professional development systems to such a level and should be provided technical assistance in understanding and implementing standards-based professional development. This demonstrates the disparity in districts across the state and the need to develop implementation and support systems that meet a variety of needs. Such a support system should lead to:

- Greater access to quality professional development for all educators, including those in rural areas
- More support for beginning teachers through quality, research based induction and mentoring programs
- Increased opportunities for veteran teachers to strengthen their knowledge and skills
- Higher retention rates for both new and experienced teachers
- An increase in student performance on a variety of measures

Current Status:

Individuals and districts primarily define professional development, though there are some statutory and State Board of Education (SBE) requirements. The most significant requirements are the 45-60 hours of instruction in Sheltered English Immersion (SEI) strategies and the 180 hours of standards-based professional development required for certification renewal. While there are many entities that provide professional development, most opportunities are accessed through local school districts or county offices. The cost per teacher of professional development appears to vary greatly across the state although very few districts can actually report what they spend per teacher on professional development, or how much time is allocated for targeted efforts during any given year.

Professional Development is defined very differently by teachers and administrators, and varies from district to district and school to school in terms of content, relevance, amount, availability and quality (*Teacher Working Conditions Survey, 2006*). Staffs in large and medium districts often have more opportunity at a lower cost to educators. Small and more isolated districts have challenges with accessibility, cost and quality. (K-12 Center Focus Groups, Fall 2006) The Arizona Department of Education (ADE), universities and community colleges, county ESA's, the Arizona K-12 Center, and a host of private entities and consultants all offer professional development to schools and teachers, generally at some cost or as a part of a particular grant or program. Some technical assistance is provided through a variety of efforts at the ADE, but they are content or program driven, such as Reading First, or Professional Development Learning Academies (PDLA), which a district must pay to attend over a three-year period of time.

Regional Access to Professional Development

Ensure that schools and educators have regional access to research-based professional development information as well as best practices for teaching and learning.

Ensure that schools and educators have regional access to highly qualified providers and that a coordinating entity exists to ensure regional capacity and accountability.

Arizona requires a formal effort to align leading research and best practices with the everyday practice of teachers and principals. The development of a system of regional structures to provide teachers and educators access to information, professional development opportunities and providers is critical to improving both the quality and effectiveness of professional development experiences. Such entities could gather the most current information on opportunities, research and best practices, provide targeted professional development based on district, school and teacher needs, and connect educators to quality providers throughout the state. A regional structure could take the form of formalizing a partnership between existing entities, or could be charged to an existing agency or organization. The state, or an existing organization charged with this task by the state, could issue a request for proposals (RFP) from interested organizations and entities, who can then apply in a competitive process for funds to establish regional entities and provide services and support to local districts, schools and educators. This regional structure could be funded for an extended period of time (e.g., three to five years), with annual renewal based on evaluation of desired outcomes.

In addition, schools and districts should have a reliable list of public and private providers who have demonstrated that they adhere to professional standards and that their professional development is effective. A defined set of criteria and a process is needed to create such a list of providers. A Professional Standards Board could serve as the coordinating agency to ensure that all Arizona schools, especially those in the most remote areas of the state, have access to quality professional development through a defined regional system.

Current Status:

Arizona has 13 county offices, all with some education responsibilities, mostly related to administrative functions. The exceptions are those counties that have created Education Service Agencies (ESA's) to provide support to teachers and administrators. These entities work with school districts in their immediate area to provide professional development opportunities utilizing some state and county dollars. They have a variety of configurations and capacity, and are governed by the County Superintendent of Education offices. Over the last few years the ADE has funded or partially funded 13 Technology Integration Specialists, 25 Reading Specialists and Math Specialists that sometimes work through the County ESA's and sometimes work directly out of the ADE with districts.

There are also a variety of partnerships with the Regent universities and school districts that operate from specific grant funding. Some examples include the Arizona K-12 Center, education and business representatives formed by the legislature in 2000, ASU's Alpha and Beta Schools Initiatives, NAU and ASU West's Distance Education programs, GEAR-Up partnerships and grants, and University of Arizona's Professional Development partnership with southern Arizona school districts.

Arizona does not have a central or regionalized system for identifying quality providers and providing that information to school districts. The ADE has preferred providers or approved vendors for some programmatic efforts, such as Reading First, Technology training and SEI. In 2004 the Arizona K-12 Center adopted a framework of criteria for

identifying “Best Practices,” but it has not been widely used or distributed to districts or schools.

While there are many opportunities in Arizona for professional development, there is little overarching coordination of opportunities or information. The ADE has compiled a publication that includes a wide variety of programs. The institutions of higher education also list some choices in addition to their degree programs on their websites and the K-12 Center has a website of opportunities throughout the calendar year. Some regional access is available, but it is often limited in its scope and focus, unevenly distributed across the state, and is not consistently based on local needs and directly designed to meet state and national standards.

Aligned Professional Development

Pilot an individual professional development process for Individual Professional Development plans and report results of the pilot to the State Board of Education by August 2008.

Local district implementation of the NSDC standards should lead districts to develop district-wide professional development plans, school plans, and Individual Professional Development Plans (IPDP). The focus of the pilot would be on how to incorporate an IPDP into a performance review process that is based on school and district goals, as well as using the IPDP for licensure renewal and to help teachers plan for and obtain the professional development needed to improve teaching and increase learning. After a two-year pilot, there should be sufficient data to indicate whether use of IPDP could be a valuable component for licensing renewal and whether statewide implementation of a comprehensive professional development planning process is warranted.

Current Status:

Alignment of standards, professional development, and programmatic efforts continues to vary greatly from district to district and school to school. Professional development is too often linked to data and standards after the fact, if at all. Districts require professional development around new programs or curriculum they have adopted, generally provided by the vendors, not necessarily developed based on an analysis of the relevant content and strategy needs of individuals or groups of teachers. Teachers often choose things that interest them and that they want to learn rather than looking at data and reflecting on strengths and areas of improvement. Standards are often applied after the professional development is designed, rather than driving the design and delivery itself.

The Arizona K-12 Center has completed the first phase of the IPDP pilot with eight districts and school sites included in the Arizona Teacher Excellence Plan (AZTEP). These schools and districts also participate in the Professional Development Learning Academies (PDLA) with the Arizona Department of Education. PDLA is designed to assist district and school teams in creating professional development plans that are relevant and connected to student and teacher data. This pilot has provided the opportunity to look at the connections between district and school planning (PDLA) and individual teacher professional development (IPDP).

The yearly AZTEP grant evaluation found that participants in the PDLA have a very positive perception of its value to their districts and schools, and found the process and training helpful to them in planning and integrating the efforts of their districts. All of these schools and districts are in the second or third year of this effort and most are beginning some implementation of their plans. The PDLA participants themselves have reported great value from both the process and the implementation, but there are indications that the impact on individual teachers at the sites is less defined. The Teacher Working Conditions Survey results available from these same districts indicate

individual teachers still see professional development as lacking relevance and connection to what they believe they need for their students. (Teacher Working Conditions Survey, 2006)

All of the AZTEP sites have been visited and in most cases program staff worked directly with the teachers and administrators regarding the development of individual plans. These plans are required to be connected to school and district goals. As of January 2007, 453 teachers had completed IPDP's with the assistance of their Master Teacher Mentors.

In general, teachers at the site level were not aware of the site and district goals developed by the PDLA process. Only two of the eight sites were very well appraised, and these were individual schools. There was also a general lack of knowledge of district and school achievement data disaggregated to the classroom level.

The process indicates a necessity to better communicate the district and site goals on an ongoing basis in order for the PDLA process to be effective in driving integrated professional development planning to the teacher level. District and site goals should be transparent to teachers and directly related to the areas of improvement identified by student and teacher data. Without this connection, the creation of IPDP's continues to be just another task without real relevance to professional growth. In addition, teachers in general need a great deal of assistance connecting district, school and site data and they need that data in an accessible form and in a timely manner in order to use it effectively. Districts continue to require multiple professional development planning tools for evaluation, Career Ladder, and re-licensure, making integrated planning difficult and IPDP's less meaningful to teachers. A full interim report to the State Board of Education will be available at the close of the AZTEP grant. Additional interim data is available from the Arizona K-12 Center.

Ensure that professional development is considered as part of any state policy initiative or mandate that impacts the classroom in a substantive way and provide additional funding for the professional development to properly implement and deliver these new initiatives and mandates.

Currently, no comprehensive system exists to ensure that educators have access and are prepared to deliver changes required by policy makers and intended to improve student learning. Professional development is often assumed or is an after thought in these policy mandates, leaving school districts, site leaders, and teachers with the task of finding the time and the resources to deliver comprehensive, standards based professional development in meaningful ways. State mandates need to acknowledge that professional development is often essential to implementation of new initiatives, and provide the technical assistance and/or full or partial funding to assist in the provision of that professional development.

Current Status:

Arizona has no consistent funding or implementation structure for professional development. Districts struggle to define the time and money necessary to do what is required within their budgets and school schedules without disrupting student learning. Larger districts create their own technical assistance for a broad range of staff, and even then it often appears disconnected to the teachers. Smaller districts and rural or isolated districts rely on the limited technical assistance available from the ADE or other entities and contracted vendors associated with particular programs or grants. The issues of identification, alignment and funding of appropriate professional development continue to be a significant policy issue for the Legislature, the State Board of Education, the Arizona Department of Education and local Governing Boards.

Professional Standards Board

Establish within the State Board of Education a Professional Standards Board to oversee the policy development of the NSDC “Standards for Staff Development” and guide implementation of standards in the field.

The State Board of Education (SBE) is the primary entity entrusted with adopting statewide policies regarding education. The SBE could oversee the approval and implementation of professional development standards in order to ensure full alignment with other policy initiatives. In this context, Professional Standards Board responsibilities might include the following:

1. Assist school districts in adopting and implementing the professional development standards.
2. Assess new state laws and mandates, new or revised teaching or learning standards, or State Board rules or programs for needed professional development.
3. Develop and implement evaluation criteria and a process for assessing all professional development sponsored by the state and making that available to school districts in a format that can be adapted for local use assessing their own professional development.
4. Submit an agenda and budget each year for professional development statewide.
5. Periodically assess the state of professional development throughout Arizona and make recommendations for its improvement.

Current Status:

There has been no action related to the formation of a Standards Board, committee or commission to deal with these recommendations at the State Board level. The SBE has discussed the item in public session as part of policy updates, but has not scheduled an in depth discussion of the issue to date. In relationship to item #4, the Governor included professional development money in her budget to expand the Master Teacher program in 2007 and the SBE received \$150,000 to study professional development, also in 2007. Item #5 was addressed in part by the 2006 Teacher Working Conditions Survey of over 7,000 teachers and administrators in 18 school districts across the state. More than 5,000, or 78 percent of those surveyed responded. The results of that survey can be found in the annual report, summarized in full at www.aztwc.org. The Executive Summary is included in **Appendix 7** of this report.

Study immediately the possibility of a comprehensive statewide Professional Standards Board. In addition to professional development, the scope of the board’s responsibilities could include certification, licensure, and oversight of the teaching standards, testing, professional development, teacher preparation, and recruitment.

Just as there is a need for an entity responsible for the policy related issues and implementation of the NSDC Standards for Staff Development, there is also a need for an aligned system of governance that considers educator certification and licensure, oversight of emerging performance based compensation, systematic teacher evaluation related to professional standards, and other critical policy issues that affect teachers’ professional duties and experiences. In recent years Arizona has received weak marks on a number of indicators of teacher quality and its ongoing inaction addressing them (*Quality Counts, 2000-2006*). The National Council of State Legislatures (NCSL) found that in 2003 Professional Standards Boards existed in 44 states. Their powers and duties vary, as do their structures and appointment processes (*Improved Teacher Quality Through Teacher Professional Standards Boards, NCSL State Legislative Report, Vol.28, No. 13, November, 2003*). Standards boards have served a valuable role in the profession by garnering both the commitment and the support of educators to develop, implement and maintain high standards for the profession. In 1996, the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (NCTAF) called for Standards Boards in every state. “Developing coherent standards for teacher education, licensing, professional development, and practice requires a governing partnership between the public and the

profession that is not vulnerable to constantly changing politics and priorities” (*What Matters Most: Teaching for America’s Future*, NCTAF, 1996).

Current Status:

The Governor’s Committee for Teacher Quality and Support (TQS) heard a lengthy presentation by the former Executive Director of the North Carolina Standards Board, and current Director of Professional Development at the NEA, Tom Blanford. Using the NCSL report referenced above, Mr. Blanford outlined the number, composition, and powers and duties of Standards Boards in 44 different states, as well as sharing his experiences with the development and implementation of the Standards Board in North Carolina and his experiences around the country. That information is summarized in **Appendix 2**. A sub-committee of four members of the TQS Committee met and developed a schematic of the scope, functions and implementation issues that could be used to define a Professional Standards Board in Arizona. That group submitted their recommendations to the full committee in June of 2005 and the committee voted to support them. These recommendations are summarized in **Appendix 2**. Education stakeholder groups have continued to pursue this effort in the form of legislation that specifically delineates a comprehensive Professional Standards Board based upon the recommendations of the sub-committee, but no other formal action has been taken to date.

Next Steps

Enhance and Improve Teacher Preparation, Recruitment and Retention efforts

(Includes recommendations from the Governor's P-20 Council's Teacher Committee)

Implement the recommendations from the P-20 Council and integrate those recommendations with those made by the Governor's Committee for Teacher Quality and Support. A full text of the Governor's P-20 Council - Teacher Committee Recommendations can be found in **Appendix 8**.

- Ensure teacher preparation programs are geared for P-20 readiness.
- Attract, prepare and retain high quality teachers in Arizona. Develop strategies to improve teacher quality, improve working conditions and attract highly qualified people into the teaching profession.
- Ensure a concentrated effort to recruit more science and mathematics teachers and to attract and train teachers already in the field to these content areas.

Develop a System of Comprehensive Teacher Compensation

(Includes recommendations from the Governor's P-20 Council's Teacher Committee)

Create a comprehensive teacher compensation system built on the development of three inter-related components, base teacher salary, performance based pay, differentiated pay and market factors. Revolutionizing teacher pay is a complex task and should be done with careful thought, good data and clear outcomes in mind. Increasing overall teacher pay in order to attract our most talented students into the profession, providing incentives and rewards to those who teach in the most challenging teaching positions, providing opportunities for reasonable career earnings and rewarding quality teaching through performance incentives will not only change the way we view teacher pay but has the potential, if done well, to change the culture of our schools. The state should determine real costs of total implementation and move forward with changes in the school funding structures to create the capacity for such a system.

Create a minimum statewide base teacher salary of at least \$30,000. Develop a standard state definition of base pay and allow districts flexibility to exceed minimum entry-level salaries. Increases in base pay for all teachers could occur as a combination of inflation, performance factors including professional growth/education, and market factors or differentiated pay.

Create one performance based pay system that is inclusive of all current legislative and initiative efforts; Career Ladder, Optional Performance Incentive Plan, The Classroom Site Fund and the Performance Based Compensation Task Force and sunset these pieces of legislation. Create a funding mechanism that allows for increased and equitable performance pay in all districts. Such a system should be developed collaboratively with staff, be understandable to all participants in the system, and allow districts flexibility within a set of state established minimum guidelines. There should be state oversight and accountability that assures that all program components are being met and those resources are being spent according to the defined system. This system could be a "bonus system" and earned yearly, or be a formulaic composite of the base, or part of

both. Any comprehensive system of performance-based pay must meet the following baseline criteria:

- Require a demonstration of pupil academic progress; grade level or school based at a minimum
- Require demonstration of improved or advanced teaching skill
- Provide opportunities to teachers for continued professional development
- Takes into consideration other components such as additional higher level instructional responsibilities

Develop a market pay/differentiated pay system that is based on supply and demand factors and school demographics. Any such system should require consistent data that demonstrates current market or demographic conditions. This is best determined by requiring similar data from every school/district that is awarded this funding.

- Market Pay should be applied to all teachers working in areas of demonstrated market shortages, not limited to hiring bonuses or stipends for new hires in those areas. This could be a factor applied to the base, which is more permanent, or a yearly “bonus” factor that ends when the shortage is no longer demonstrated.
- Differentiated Pay is defined as additional pay for those teachers currently working or willing to work in underperforming/failing schools, pay for working in high poverty schools, schools with high transience rates or any combination of the above factors.

Build Strategic and Systemic Professional Development

(Includes recommendations from the Governor’s P-20 Council’s Teacher Committee)

Adopt and implement the National Staff Development Council’s “Standards for Staff Development” as the guiding standards for developing and providing professional development in Arizona schools. Arizona should continue to build infrastructure and resources to provide technical assistance to schools and districts in order to implement professional development that is aligned with the NSDC Standards, embedded in teacher practice, data driven and relevant. Quality professional development must be a part of any state policy initiative or mandate that impacts the classroom in a substantive way and provide additional funding for the professional development to properly implement and deliver these new initiatives and mandates.

Provide professional development in key content areas, particularly in math and science. Make available and utilize a variety of delivery systems, such as on-line instruction, seminars, school and team based professional development and higher education coursework to focus on improved content knowledge for teachers. Identify needs based on current knowledge and build professional development opportunities to meet those needs.

Provide ongoing technology training and development to improve and enhance teacher use of technology for classroom instruction, data management and analysis, and enhanced professional productivity in order to improve student learning. Develop a common suite of essential technology tools and ensure well-delivered access to both the tools and the training.

Restructure the K-12 school year to include opportunities for embedded professional development into the work year by funding additional days for professional development.

Provide a statewide, centrally funded mentoring and induction program for teachers that are in their first one-two years of teaching by building on and expanding the current Master Teacher Mentor initiative. The program should fund districts to develop and implement programs that meet the Arizona Induction Standards, based on the number of one-two year teachers they have in their districts.

Develop regional professional development centers/partnerships to ensure that all educators have regional access to high quality professional development that is grounded in research and best practices. State requirements for professional development should be delivered, at least in part, through these partnerships. In the absence of a Professional Standards Board, the State Board of Education should identify a coordinating entity to facilitate the development of regional capacity for delivery of professional development and ensure accountability. Should the state approve a Professional Standards Board, this effort should fall under its scope of authority.

Create a Professional Standards Board

Arizona should establish a Professional Standards Board whose scope of work shall include oversight of policy development related to implementation of a statewide professional development system based upon the National Staff Development Council Standards (NSDC) for Professional Development. In addition, the scope of the Board's responsibilities shall include all matters related to educator certification, licensure, oversight of the teaching standards, licensure/certification assessment, and approval of teacher preparation programs as recommended by the Governor's Committee for Teacher Quality and Support.

Make the Teacher Working Conditions Survey a Statewide effort

Expand the pilot of the Working Conditions Survey to a statewide survey of all districts and conduct it at least every two years. Form a standing advisory committee to review data from previous years, identify useful policy trends, suggest new items, and create timelines and work plans for the next cycle. Designate an entity to manage the survey and assist in the facilitation and use of the data for statewide, district and school level discussion and planning.

1. Summary of Statistics and Reports
2. Professional Standards Board – Summary and Recommendations
3. Glossary of Terms and Definitions
4. References
5. Executive Orders
6. National Staff Development Standards, Revised 2001
7. 2006 Teacher Working Conditions Survey, Executive Summary
8. Governor's P-20 Council - Teacher Committee Recommendations

Appendix 1: Summary of Statistics and Reports

Vital Statistics for Arizona

Number of school districts	219
Number of schools	2,047
Number of charter schools	498
Pre-K-12 enrollment	1,043,298
Number of public school teachers	48,935 (FTE)
Students in Title I schools	55.5%
Minority students	51.7%
Eligible for free and reduced lunch	48%
Students with disabilities	18.1%
English-language learners	18.6%
Per pupil expenditures	\$6,465
Pupil/teacher ratio	21.3

Source: NAEP, State Profile, 3/22/2006, <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/states/profile.asp>

Previous Reports and Recommendations

The Governor's Task Force on Efficiency and Accountability in K-12 Education, (2001), put forth suggestions on alignment of curricula, increased accountability, reviewing Career Ladder and creating a teacher pay-for-performance system linked to student achievement, and direction of more financial resources to student achievement.

A Pre-K-12 Education: Choices for Arizona's Future report from an Arizona Town Hall in 2004 stressed the early identification of students at risk, aligning instruction with knowledge and skills needed in the workplace and for entry into high education, engaging parents as partners in the education of their children, and identification of best practice for teaching non-English language learners. The report also suggested a starting salary for beginning teachers of \$35,000.

Lead with Five: Five Investments to Improve Arizona Public Education (Waits & Fulton, 2005), recommended providing full-day kindergarten, preparing and recognizing teachers for high performance, creating smaller schools, reducing class size in kindergarten through third grade, and providing extra help for students experiencing difficulty.

Summary of Recommendations for Improving Teacher Quality includes a synopsis of recommendations appearing most frequently in 21 reports, articles, and other publications on improving teacher quality. These general recommendations from the body of literature fall into two major categories.

Improving Professional Development:

- Establish professional development as a regular component of the school program and develop scheduling or staffing options (e.g. teaching teams) that will enable most professional development to take place during the school day;
- Align professional development with state teaching and learning standards;
- Develop district and school professional development plans based on state, district, and school goals and teacher needs;
- Implement high quality professional development that is aligned with research and effective practice; and
- Provide induction and mentoring programs for all new teachers.

Strengthening Teacher Compensation:

- Provide starting salaries that are comparable to other professions with similar entry requirements;
- Establish career paths so that teachers can advance to higher levels and be rewarded financially for their efforts;
- Provide incentives, especially higher pay, for teachers willing to work in rural, isolated areas or in high poverty schools;
- Base pay on performance measures that demonstrate the “value” they add to student achievement;
- Determine whether there is a teacher shortage problem, or much more likely, a teacher retention problem; and
- Reduce bureaucratic hiring procedures in districts; give principals the flexibility and authority to make hiring decisions.

Appendix 2: Professional Standards Board – Summary and Recommendations

Chart A-Summary of Key Issues

Issue	Additional considerations	Structural Issues
Professionals own their own standards. Teachers will take this very seriously.	Standards boards with a majority of educators feel ownership to the profession in a way they do not feel when they are not directly responsible for issues central to the profession.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Depending on the scope, could include all affected; administrators, classified personal, specialists, etc.
Standards Boards are necessary to be successful.	They have different structures and different roles. They can work in partnership with State Boards of Education where policy issues overlap. They must work in concert with other policy-making entities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Educator majority Include teacher leadership Ensure diversity, in personnel and geography Find public members who are committed Isolate as much as possible from political currents Provide initial and ongoing training and development in key policy issues
Autonomy and Decision making matter.	If you are going to have a standards board, create the structure and define the authority and do it. Don't create an advisory authority that can never get more than a "pat on the head" for good ideas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can have a range of authority, but they must have defined authority over issues that matter to the profession There is no "perfect" structure. Create what works in Arizona Should have a budget and staff of its own
Define the authority specifically.	Outlined five key areas of possible action which are most often found in some configuration in existing standards boards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standards and processes for initial licensure Renewal of certification and embedded professional development Program approval of teacher preparation programs Professional ethics and practices, including revocation, though this should not be the only thing they do. License administration and processing

Chart B- Recommendations of the Subcommittee

Authority and areas of responsibility	Structure	Funding
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Certification 2. Professional standards 3. Preparation program approval 4. Professional development 5. Professional conduct, investigations and hearings 6. Federal laws and regulations related to teacher licensure and qualifications 	<p>Create a 17 member Board, appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the Senate to serve staggered 5-year terms. Members would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supt. of Public Instruction • 7 state certified teachers • 3 administrators • 1 school board member • 2 representatives from a higher education institute that prepares teachers • 1 representative from the State Board of Education • 2 public members <p>An Executive Director would serve at the pleasure of the Board.</p>	<p>Would be funded by fees and/or state appropriation.</p> <p>Current funding for the Professional Practices Advisory Committee would be transferred to the Board.</p> <p>After the first year of operation, the Board will make recommendations to the legislature and the Governor regarding staffing and funding needs that cannot be met with the recommended fee allocation or state appropriation.</p>

Appendix 3: Glossary of Terms and Definitions

Career Ladder

A program of defining levels of pay for teachers based upon a review of professional work and evaluation that must include opportunities for advanced roles and responsibilities, demonstration of improved or advanced teaching skill and improved student achievement. In its current form it is a yearly bonus system paid in addition to the regular salary schedule.

Source: ASRS Title 15:918

Differentiated Pay

A pay structure that pays individuals different amounts based upon their willingness to work under certain conditions or in certain areas.

Market Pay

A pay structure that pays individuals based upon market forces, such as shortages, or based upon special abilities, skills or talents that are necessary in the workplace at any given time.

Performance Based Pay

A pay structure that is designed to reward performance based on meeting goals and objectives, utilizing commonly understood evaluations and assessments of that performance, and measuring growth toward the objectives.

Professional Development

Effective professional development is job related and models the context, processes, and content by which educators acquire, enhance, and sustain the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and beliefs necessary to create high levels of learning for all students.

Source: The Governor's Committee for Teacher Quality and Support, October 3, 2005

Professional Standards Board

An independent or advisory group made up of a majority of educators, designed to govern specific aspects of the education profession.

Source: Improving Quality Through Teacher Professional Standards Boards, National Council of State Legislatures, November 2003.

A Quality Teacher

A quality teacher at any level is passionate about student learning; possesses comprehensive knowledge of what is taught; understands how students learn and develop cognitively, physically, socially and emotionally; and demonstrates the ability to apply his or her own knowledge so that every student may develop dispositions that lead to a love of learning and the desire to become successful and productive members of a democratic society.

Source: "A Quality Teacher: Pre-K and K-12," Teacher Education Partnership Commission, August 2005.

Appendix 4: References

Comparison of BA Minimums, 2004-05 and 2003-04, Arizona Education Association Research and Development Center (2005)

Arizona's Instrument to Measure Standards (2005, Spring). Retrieved from www.ade.state.az.us/researchpolicy/AIMSResults/

Pre-k-12 education: Choices for Arizona's Future. Report of the eighty-fourth Arizona town hall. (2004, June 13-16) Arizona Town Hall.

Exstrom, M. (2002). *Cultivating High-Quality Professional Development*. Washington, D.C. National Conference of State Legislatures.

Gau, R., Palmer, L. B., Melnick, R., & Heffernon, R. (2003, January). *Is There a Teacher Shortage? Demand and Supply in Arizona*. Tempe, AZ: Morrison Institute for Public Policy, Arizona State University.

Koehler, P. H. (2001, December). *Improving Student Achievement in Arizona: Report by the Governor's Task Force on Efficiency and Accountability in K-12 Education*. Phoenix, AZ: WestEd.

Morgan Quitno Press, (2005, October). *Education State Rankings 2005-2006*. Retrieved from www.morganquitno.com

National Assessment of Education Progress State Profiles. (2005 and 2005). Retrieved from www.nces.ed.gov

National Education Association. (2003 & 2004). *Rankings & Estimates: Rankings of the States 2003 and Estimates of School Statistics 2004*. Retrieved from RankingsEstimates@nea.org

National Staff Development Council. (2001) *Standards for Staff Development*. Oxford, OH: Author.

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. Public Law 108-110, amending Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 V.S.C. 6301 et seq.).

Sloat, E. F. (2002, March). *Comparative Student Achievement Between Career Ladder and Non-Career Ladder Districts on the Spring 2001 Stanford 9 – Grades 2 through 8*. Glendale, AZ: Peoria Unified School District.

"Stat of the Week." (2005, December 21). *Education Week*. Retrieved from www.edweek.org (Education Counts database).

State Highlights 2006: Arizona. (2006, January 4). Quality Counts at 10: A Decade of Standards-Based Education. *EducationWeek*. Retrieved from www.edweek.org/qc06.

State of the States: Arizona. (2005, January 5). Quality Counts 2005: No Small Change, Targeting Money Toward Student Performance. *Education Week* 24 (17), 109.

Teacher Education Partnership Commission (2005, August). *A Quality Teacher: Pre-K – K-12*. Tempe, AZ: Author.

Waits, M. J., & Fulton, W. (2005, February). *Lead with Five: Five Investments to Improve Arizona Public Education*. Phoenix, AZ: Rodel Foundation of Arizona.

Appendix 5: Executive Orders

Napolitano, J. (2005, May), Executive Order 2005-11. Retrieved from www.governor.state.az.us/tqs/

Napolitano, J. (2005, August), Executive Order 2005-19. Retrieved from www.governor.state.az.us/P20/

Napolitano, J. (2005, October), Executive Order 2005-23. Retrieved from www.governor.state.az.us/tqs/

Napolitano, J. (2005, August), Executive Order 2005-29. Retrieved from www.azgovernor.gov/P20

Appendix 6: National Staff Development Standards, Revised 2001

Context Standards

Staff development that improves the learning of all students:

- Organizes adults into learning communities whose goals are aligned with those of the school and district. (Learning Communities)
- Requires skillful school and district leaders who guide continuous instructional improvement. (Leadership)
- Requires resources to support adult learning and collaboration. (Resources)

Process Standards

Staff development that improves the learning of all students:

- Uses disaggregated student data to determine adult learning priorities, monitor progress, and help sustain continuous improvement. (Data-Driven)
- Uses multiple sources of information to guide improvement and demonstrate its impact. (Evaluation)
- Prepares educators to apply research to decision making. (Research-Based)
- Uses learning strategies appropriate to the intended goal. (Design)
- Applies knowledge about human learning and change. (Learning)
- Provides educators with the knowledge and skills to collaborate. (Collaboration)

Content Standards

Staff development that improves the learning of all students:

- Prepares educators to understand and appreciate all students, create safe, orderly and supportive learning environments, and hold high expectations for their academic achievement. (Equity)
- Deepens educators' content knowledge, provides them with research-based instructional strategies to assist students in meeting rigorous academic standards, and prepares them to use various types of classroom assessments appropriately. (Quality Teaching)
- Provides educators with knowledge and skills to involve families and other stakeholders appropriately. (Family Involvement)

Appendix 7: 2006 Teacher Working Conditions Survey

Executive Summary

Emerging research from across the nation demonstrates that school working conditions—time, teacher empowerment, school leadership, professional development, and facilities and resources — are critical to increasing student achievement and retaining teachers.

The existing national data regarding the impact of working conditions on student achievement and teacher turnover provided a meaningful impetus for 18 Arizona districts to collect and analyze data to inform local working condition reform strategies as part of a state phase-in working conditions initiative.

Governor Janet Napolitano, the Arizona Education Association, the Arizona Teacher Excellence Plan (AZTEP) partnership, leadership in 18 school districts and other stakeholders conducted the survey to provide information that can be used for data-driven school improvement planning, faculty conversations and consideration of district and school policies and programs. By placing the perceptions of Arizona educators at the center of school and district efforts to improve teacher recruitment and retention, the ultimate goal of the initiative is to help create a stable teaching force that allows for a high quality teacher in every classroom across the state.

Analysis of the approximately 5,200 survey responses (representing over 70 percent of educators eligible to participate in the survey) demonstrates that working conditions are correlated with AIMS results in math, reading and writing as well as teachers' future employment plans. Of the various data implications from the survey, five primary findings are highlighted in this report:

1. Teacher Working Conditions are Correlated with Student Achievement

The overall findings from the analysis regarding the impact of working conditions on student achievement provide evidence to support the notion that teacher working conditions are student learning conditions. The analyses specifically point to the need to provide safe, trusting environments with sufficient instructional resources for all teachers to be successful.

2. Teacher Working Conditions Influence Teacher Employment Plans

Statistically significant correlations between working conditions and teachers' desires to stay were found for all working conditions. Connections are particularly strong for the conditions of school leadership and empowerment.

3. Teachers and Administrators View Working Conditions Differently

There are considerable gaps between the perceptions of teachers and administrators regarding the degree to which school leadership addresses teacher concerns. While some discrepancies might be expected between administrators and teachers on a measure of leadership effectiveness, the degree of these discrepancies is startling and must be taken into consideration for any working conditions reforms to be successful.

4. Schools Vary in the Presence of Teacher Working Conditions

The greatest differences in teacher perceptions of working conditions appear across schools. Basic differences between teachers themselves appear to make limited difference in how they perceive working conditions. Teachers, regardless of gender, education, race, ethnicity, and even years of experience, view working conditions similarly. However, there are differences between elementary, middle and high schools as well as AZTEP and non-AZTEP schools.

5. Arizona Teachers are More Negative about Working Conditions than Teachers in Other States

In general, Arizona educators were more likely to note the presence of positive working conditions than those in Clark County, Nevada (Las Vegas) and Ohio (about one-third of respondents are from Columbus and Cleveland), but less so than their peers in Kansas and North Carolina. Of particular importance is that Arizona educators have the most negative perception about their faculty being committed to helping every student learn (10 percent lower than the next closest state/district).

More in-depth analysis of each of the five working conditions areas (along with mentoring and induction) is also provided within the body of this report.

Recommendations

From these findings and the domain analysis, recommendations for Arizona educators and policymakers are offered to enhance efforts to improve teacher working conditions.

- 1. Expand the Arizona Teacher Working Conditions Survey Statewide in Spring 2007.**
- 2. Ensure the data from the 2006 survey is used by educators and develop assistance for working conditions reform to be available when statewide data is released.**
- 3. Invest in school leaders who can create positive teaching and learning conditions.**
- 4. Invest substantially in teacher support.**

The data available from the 2006 Teacher Working Conditions Survey and across the nation indicate that improving these teaching and learning conditions is a critical step to improving schools. Significant correlations between working conditions, AIMS performance and teacher employment decisions were documented in the 2006 survey.

Arizona educators must have the resources and support they need to serve all students well. Without comprehensive, sustained efforts to analyze and improve teacher working conditions, notable efforts to improve student learning and retain teachers cannot be fully successful.

Appendix 8: Governor's P-20 Council - Teacher Committee Recommendations

Building on the work of the Governor's Committee for Teacher Quality and Support, the Governor's P-20 Council Teachers Committee continues the implementation of recommendations to improve and enhance teacher pre-service training and professional development systems and address teacher pay and benefits in order to attract, prepare and retain high quality teachers in Arizona.

1. Ensure Teacher preparation programs are geared for P-20 Readiness.

- a. Ensure 21st Century preparation format
- b. Require, recognize and reward the effective use of education technology including certifications and endorsements
- c. Establish standards for use during pre-service classroom teaching experience
- d. Ensure student teachers receive adequate content area training and increase collaboration between colleges of education and other disciplines
- e. Require, recognize and reward certifications and endorsements in the areas of early childhood development, middle school content areas, and reading

2. Attract, prepare and retain high quality teachers in Arizona. Develop strategies to improve teacher quality, improve working conditions and attract highly qualified people into the teaching profession.

- a. Provide funding for students during their student teaching semesters
- b. Provide forgivable loans for high-needs placements
- c. Reduce tuition during student teaching
- d. Tuition waivers for students entering high-needs subject areas
- e. Increase incentives for recruitment to high-needs subject areas and hard-to-staff schools
- f. Provide for centrally funded mentoring and induction activities
- g. Consider state income tax benefit to off-set costs associated with career transition
- h. Address other incentives such as insurance benefits and housing incentives
- i. Explore P-12 options to encourage Arizona students to select teaching as a career

3. Ensure a concentrated effort to recruit more science and mathematics teachers and to attract and train teachers already in the field to these content areas through:

- a. Scholarships
- b. Bonuses for teachers working in underserved areas
- c. Math and Science Institutes for continued professional development
- d. Increased AP and IB training for teachers
- e. Ensure high quality teaching through well-developed curriculum, standards and assessments of student learning

4. Provide for statewide professional development.

- a. Ensure that professional development is standards based, embedded, data driven and relevant
- b. Ensure professional development for in-service teachers in content areas (e.g. math and science)
- c. Develop a common suite of essential technology tools and ensure web-delivered access to both the tools and the training
- d. Provide training and ensure use of web-based formative assessments
- e. Ensure regional network for teachers
- f. Ensure career opportunities
- g. Provide mentoring

5. **Address teacher pay.** The Governor's Committee for Teacher Quality and Support has completed a great deal of work in this regard and recommendations have been forwarded to the Governor for review and consideration. This Committee subscribes to these recommendations to address:
 - a. Teacher compensation is competitive
 - b. Market based: math, science, special education
 - c. Performance-based wage enhancements
6. **Prioritize the implementation of needed data elements pursuant to the recommendations in the National Data Quality Campaign.**
 - a. Implement teacher identification systems in order to have better data on teacher preparation, supply and performance
 - b. Make formative assessments and data universally available
 - c. Make technology available to all teachers, ensure that teachers are trained in the use of technology to deliver instruction and to enhance professional productivity and provide for disaggregating student data